

**Community Advisory Council
October 11, 2001
Action Items/Notes**

Final

These notes are in the following order:

1. Attendance
2. Correspondence and handouts
3. Quorum
4. Administrative
5. Presentation on OU V/Peconic River, Skip Medeiros, Project Manager
6. Discussion /input on OU V
7. Community comment
8. Presentation on BGRR Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis, Chuck Adey, Group Manager
9. Discussion/recommendations on BGRR EE/CA
10. November agenda

1. Attendance:

Present:

Members- R. Amper, G. Campbell, A. Capozzi, R. Clipperton, B. Conklin, J. Corrarino, A. Esposito, M. Giacomaro, J. Gibbons, H. Guthy, J. Heil, J. Jordon-Sweet, E. Kaplan, G. Proios, M. Shea, M. Walker.

Alternates- R. Biss, A. Graves, J. Grindrod, J. Minasi.

Others- C. Adey, P. Bond, J. Carter, J. Clodius, J. D'Ascoli, B. Desmarais, K. Geiger, K. Geigoletta, M. Holland, S. Kumar, S. Medeiros, L. Nelson, M. Parsons, R. Paulsen, A. Rapiejko, J. Rohlf, K. Shaw, K. White.

Absent:

Members- M. Barrett, M. Cohn, S. Cullen, A. Drake, N. Essel, D. Fischler, A. Jones, J. Kassner, C. Kepert, J. Mannhaupt, P. Martino, C. Swenson, T. Talbot, F. Towle, J. Tripp.

Alternates- S. Bail, S. Carlin, A. Cooley, K. Crowley, W. Evanzia, T. Guglielmo, B. Henigin, L. Jacobson, R. Johannesen, B. Martin, J. McLoughlin, G. Miglino, J. Pannullo, P. Pizzo, W. Prospect, K. Skinner, L. Snead, P. Stephens, K. Timmins.

2. Correspondence and Handouts

(Items 1 – 6 were mailed with a cover letter dated July 6, 2001. Item 7 was included in the folders and items 8 and 9 were available as handouts.)

1. Draft agenda for October.
2. Draft July notes.
3. Final approved notes, June 14, 2001.
4. Copy of Dr. Marburger's BNL overview.

5. Fact Sheet, Road Map to Peconic River Cleanup.
6. Copy of Tim Hallman's June 14 RHIC presentation.
7. Presentation on BGRR Lower Canal, Equipment, and Associated Soils, Chuck Adey, Group Manager Reactor Projects.
8. Presentation on Path to Peconic River Cleanup, Skip Medeiros, Group Manager.
9. Letter dated July 30, 2001 from Bob Conklin to Mary Logan.

3. Quorum

The meeting began at 6:34 p.m. A quorum was established when 18 of the 32 member organizations were present.

4. Administrative

Approval of the notes of the July 12 meeting was deferred because a quorum was not present. Reed welcomed everyone back and introduced Marge Lynch. Ms. Lynch gave a brief status on Dr. Marburger's confirmation hearings and the search for his replacement. She reintroduced Tom Sheridan, Deputy Director for Operations, who participated in the meeting.

5. Presentation on OU V/ Peconic River, Skip Medeiros, Project Manager

Mr. Medeiros gave a presentation on status of the Peconic River cleanup. He discussed the areas identified for cleanup, the pilot programs, and told how the results would be evaluated to determine if they should be continued. Medeiros discussed the strengths, disadvantages, and costs of the proposed methods, which include use of a vacuum guzzler, electrochemical remediation, phytoremediation, and sediment removal/restoration.

6. Discussion/input on OU V.

CAC members thanked Skip and the project staff for doing such a great job responding to community concerns and suggestions. Discussion included costs, where the money for the pilot projects was coming from, and when information would be available to decide how to proceed. Decisions on methods to be used will be made early next fall. Medeiros urged the CAC to use the criteria that the Laboratory is required to use when it makes its recommendations. Skip Medeiros said that approximately 18% of what is believed to be the contaminated area was included in the studies.

Bob Conklin introduced into discussion correspondence that he had written to the regulators regarding the need for cleanup and shared the response from the DEC with CAC members. He discussed the reports used to identify contaminants and questioned the information in them. There were questions concerning contamination concentration levels needed to trigger action. It was stated that there are numbers in the EPA statutes that mandate action irrespective of whether or not they are causing damage.

Reed clarified Bob's concerns asking if the problem was that there seemed to be conflicting information. It was suggested by a CAC member that this subject be taken up by a CAC subcommittee that could come back with some conclusions, suggestions, and observations that the group could move on quickly. Ken White talked about the structure of a Peconic River Working Group and suggested that meetings that included the CAC subcommittee be held. CAC member Proios also suggested looking at new budgetary constraints.

Reed summarized the subcommittee's charge to conduct a CAC examination of the need for remediation of the Peconic River and bring back their analysis and a proposed recommendation to lay in front of the group as a whole by December, or earlier if possible. Reed asked if any CAC member felt that was inappropriate. Member Esposito asked, "how we got here so quickly? All of a sudden now everyone on the CAC agrees we need to examine whether or not the river needs to be cleaned-up? The subcommittee was originally charged with evaluating the cleanup plan and all that. Are we just asking the subcommittee to go back and look at this one thing?" Reed stated that he didn't think so. He said that was a question for the subcommittee to answer, but there's also the Working Group itself. It was his impression that the subcommittee is going to participate in the review of the plan and the pilots and participate in its mission. Member Jordan-Sweet stated that it was important to her to see the evidence, the facts gathered, and a case made. It was decided that those who had expressed interest in the Working Group at the July meeting would be part of the Working Group as well as any additional volunteers.

CAC member Grindrod recommended moving the discussion on energy to November. Member Esposito seconded the motion. It was agreed to do this.

BAO Manager Mike Holland gave a brief update on the County's grant request. He said that DOE is still looking at ways to try to get the grant put into place.

7. Community Comment

There was a question regarding the proposed use of the vacuum guzzler. Its operation was further explained.

Mike Holland also announced that former BAO Manager, George Malosh, had been diagnosed with bladder cancer, had surgery, and was recovering.

Action Item: It was agreed that a message would be sent to George Malosh from the CAC members.

8. Presentation on the BGRR EE/CA, Chuck Adey, Group Manager

Chuck Adey, the Reactor Projects Group Manager, explained that the BGRR work had been broken into seven smaller segments to make it more manageable. He provided an update on the work completed or in progress for each segment. He described the area covered under the current Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis, which included part of the lower canal, equipment removal, and associated soils and the contamination associated with them. He outlined the five remediation alternatives proposed stating that 66% of all the radioactivity would be removed by Alternative 2. Alternative 3 removes 86% of the source, but has no impact on the radioactive health impacts and Alternative 4 removes 91% of the source. Adey next stated the reasons for selecting the second alternative. A CAC member questioned why the potential dose remaining did not change for Alternatives 2 through 4. Clyde Newsome explained how the res rad model worked, how decay over time was factored in, and why the doses did not change even though more of the source was removed. A CAC member expressed his concern that there was more risk for exposure in the remediation activities than in leaving the contamination there, sealing it, and capping it. There was some concern about the risk of any remaining radioactive material in regard to terrorist activity. BAO Manager Mike Holland reported that in looking at overall risk and how appropriate action is being taken to protect the Laboratory, he did not see a

clear difference as far as the security principal is concerned from the terrorist standpoint, in any of the alternatives.

9. Discussion/recommendations on BGRR EE/CA

CAC member Adrienne Esposito stated that her organization (CCE) supports Alternative 4 and explained that they were looking at future land use. CCE thinks a more comprehensive cleanup should take place. There was discussion on how the alternatives were chosen, and why “common sense” alternatives weren’t offered. There was a discussion on risk, government standards, and different interpretations of what should be allowed. Reed pointed out that there were two sets of values being discussed around the table – values associated with risk and risk reduction, contamination left in the environment, regardless of risk, and how budget affects priorities. He pointed out that source removal could be a value and objective in and of itself without going after risk. He asked CAC members to remember that the issue could be looked at from both perspectives. CAC member Proios pointed out that funding had an impact and that when money was limited the issue that posed the greatest risk to the greatest number of people should be addressed. Reed reminded members that they were in the middle of a public comment period, and encouraged groups/individuals to submit comments.

10. November Agenda

- Energy discussion
- OU V
 - Project Group
 - Subcommittee Evaluation
 - Pilot work plans/status
 - Sampling/cleanup goal update
- Science presentation
- BGRR canal EE/CA December?
- BGRR below grade EE/CA
- Fire Management Plan (Spring 02)